IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRIMINAL REVISION NO.2430 OF 2005

DATE OF DECISION: MAY 15, 2007

Sher Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Smt.Charanjit Kaur @ Sarvjeet Kaur and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RANJIT SINGH

1. **Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement?**
2. **To be referred to the Reporters or not?**
3. **Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

PRESENT: Mr. Ashok Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

*****

RANJIT SINGH, J.

Respondent, Charanjit Kaur @ Sarvjeet Kaur and Kamlesh @ Jasbir Kaur were prosecuted for offences under Sections 306, 504, 506 and 120-B IPC. They were acquitted by Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal by giving them benefit of doubt. Complainant, Sher Singh, has filed this revision, impugning the said order of acquittal.

In the complaint filed, no grievance was raised which could indicate abetment on the part of the respondents. The trial Court accordingly found that the statement made by the complainant to the police does not contain any allegation or role of abetment, which is attributed to the respondents. Son of

the complainant married to respondent, Charanjit Kaur and they both were leading a happy married life. As per the record, there was no mis-understanding between them, which could give indication of abetment on the part of respondents to suicide committed by the son of the complainant. Suicide note was the main basis to allege abetment to suicide but the Court found that was not proved beyond reasonable doubt. Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the Court did not rely on the suicide note saying that science of hand-writing expert can not said to be a perfect science and hence, viewed that the suicide note was not proved. This reasoning, as per the counsel, is not justified in law or otherwise. It is seen that this is not the only reason, which weighed with the trial Court to discard the suicide note but it found that the note was not properly proved by the prosecution. The hand-writing/signatures on the suicide note were compared with the standard documents, containing hand-writing and signatures of the deceased. The trial Court noticed that these documents were not proved by any evidence on record. Learned counsel, however, submits that these documents were proved by the deposition of PW2 Janardhan, who had identified the hand-writing of the deceased. This would be of no avail as PW2 admitted before the court that the deceased was in 2nd/3rd standard when the witness was studying in graduation as such, he would not be in any competent position to identify the hand-writing of the deceased. Counsel would then submit that discrepancies and contradictions in the evidence as noted in regard to discovery/recovery of the suicide note are not made out from the evidence on record. Contradictions and discrepancies are noticeable and otherwise are not the only reason,

for which the respondents were acquitted. In my considered opinion, no case for interference is made out.

The revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

May 15, 2007 **(RANJIT SINGH)**
khurmi **JUDGE**